REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are all the claims pending in the application. Of these claims, claims 1, 5 and 6 are in independent form. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7 are amended. No new matter is presented.

To summarize the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaille Frederic (EP 1209035) in view of Inoue et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,439,059, hereinafter "Chaille") and claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaille Frederic. Further, the Examiner objected to claims 2 and 7 for depending from a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Applicant respectfully traverses.

With respect to the rejection of independent claim 1, Applicant notes that claim 1 is presently amended to partially incorporate the subject matter of claim 2, which was indicated by the Examiner as containing allowable subject matter. For instance, claim 1 recites a method of predicting a displacement range of a wire harness comprising, *inter alia*, a computing step including computing two predictive routes which satisfy the values of the length of the basic route, the fixing positions, the fixing directions and the minimum bending radius, and the two predictive routes being respectively closest to the fixing points; obtaining a plurality of computing points for computing the displacement range based on the predictive routes; and computing outermost points of a plurality of predictive routes which satisfy the values of the

route length, the fixing positions, the fixing directions and the minimum bending radius, at each of the plurality of computing points. Further, claim 1 recites displaying the displacement range of the wire harness in three dimensions by using the outermost points.

Applicant submits that the method defined by claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by Chaille Frederic in view of Inoue. For instance, Chaille Frederic teaches a method for allocating space required by a moving wire harness in a vehicle by measuring a dimension of the wire harness and subsequently calculating the area and volume required by the wire harness as it moves in the vehicle. (Chaille Frederic at column 1, lines 44-52). More specifically, Chaille Frederic teaches calculating an area associated with a moving wire harness from two distance measurements (i.e., distances K1 and K2) associated with the wire loop and its movement. (Chaille Frederic at column 3, lines 23-38 and Figure 2). Further, Chaille Frederic teaches a volume determination using the area calculation and a measurement (i.e., dimension d) for the length of the wire loop extending over the first and second mounting surfaces. (Chaille Frederic at page 3, lines 39-44 and Figure 3). Thus, Chaille Frederic merely teaches a simple area and volume determination based on three length measurements and therefore fails to teach or suggest *at least* the limitations of the claimed computing and display operations, as set forth in claim 1.

Further, Applicant submits that Innoue fails to teach the limitations which are deficient in Chaille Frederic. For instance, Inoue merely teaches a prediction of the bending life for wires or wire harnesses, which is calculated by repetitively bending the wire or wire harness and obtaining a value for a distortional change quantity, wherein a correlation determined from a

measured value of bending life is used to predict bending life based on a measured distortional change quantity. (Inoue at col. 1, line 61 - col. 2, line 19; col. 5, line 54 - col. 6, line 30).

Thus, the combination of Chaille Frederic and Innoue fail to teach *at least* the above discussed limitations of claim 1. Therefore, even assuming *arguendo* that the Examiner's motivation to combine Chaille Frederic and Innoue is proper, the combination fails to teach all the limitations of the claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is requested.

Further, Applicant submits that the above arguments are equally applicable to claim 6, which has likewise been amended to partially incorporate the subject matter of objected to claim 7 and similarly recites a predicting program for executing a method with similar limitations. Therefore, claim 6 should be allowed. In addition, Applicant submits that claims 2-4 and 7-8 are allowable at least by virtue of depending from claims 1 and 6, respectively, and allowance of claims 2-4 and 7-8 is requested.

With respect to the rejection of claim 5, Applicant submits that the above arguments with respect to the deficient teaching of Chaille Frederic are equally applicable to claim 5. Claim 5 recites a predicting device with similar limitations as in claims 1 and 6. As discussed above, Applicant submits that *at least* the above described features are deficient in Chaille Frederic and are neither taught nor suggested by the reference. Therefore, claim 5 should likewise be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Application No. 10/656,264

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC   Brian K. Shelton
Telephone: (202) 293-7060   Registration No. 50,245
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 28, 2005